

REMARKS

In the November 29, 2007 Office Action, the Examiner objected to claim 1 due to several informalities, rejected claims 1-5, 7, 9, 11-52 and 56-65 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,320,974 to Glaze et al., and indicated that claims 6, 8 and 10 would be allowable if re-written in independent form. Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating that claims 6, 8 and 10 contain allowable subject matter. Applicant has re-written claim 6 in independent form and submits that claim 6 is now allowable. Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's other objections and rejections.

With respect to the Examiner's objections to claim 1 due to informalities, Applicants have amended claim 1 to replace the commas ending the various phrases of the claim with semicolons. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner's objections in this regard be withdrawn. The Examiner additionally indicated similar objections to claim 53, but since that claim was withdrawn in response to a prior restriction requirement, applicants believe no response is necessary to that objection.

With respect to the Examiner's rejections based upon Glazer et al., Applicants submit that the Examiner's rejections are misplaced. Specifically, the Examiner cites to column 3, lines 13-15 of Glazer et al as corresponding to the "document scanner" recited in the claims of the present application. Specifically, the cited portion of Glazer et al. reads as follows:

In another embodiment of the present invention, the laptop computer, camera, fingerprint scanner and modem/radiotelephone are electronically coupled together and conveniently housed in a carrying case.

One can see that this portion of Glazer et al. discloses a fingerprint scanner rather than a document scanner. The present application distinguishes between document scanners and fingerprint scanners in numerous places, including but not limited to paragraphs [0024], [0025], [0027], [0030], [0034], [0035] and [0041]. Nowhere in Glazer et al. is there a

disclosure of a combination including a document scanner such as is recited in the pending claims. In fact, this deficiency of Glazer et al. becomes especially conspicuous with respect to the Examiner's rejections of claim 12, and several dependant claims, that recite both a document scanner and a fingerprint scanner. The Examiner points to item 60 in Fig. 5 of Glazer et al. as corresponding to the claimed fingerprint scanner and points to col. 13, lines 13-15 as corresponding to the claimed document scanner. In actuality, however, item 60 in Fig. 5 of Glazer et al. is the same fingerprint scanner recited at col. 3, lines 13-15 of Glazer et al. Similarly, with respect to claim 56 the Examiner reads the camera of Glazer et al. as being both the claimed means for scanning a facial image on an identification document and the claimed means for a taking a digital image of a face. In claim 56 and the in the present specification, however, the document scanner and camera are clearly separate devices.

The distinction between a fingerprint scanner and a document scanner is an important one. Like a camera, a fingerprint scanner captures biometric data that can be compared to various databases. A system having both a fingerprint scanner and a camera obviously provides an extra level of security being a system having just a camera or just a fingerprint scanner because it allows comparison to databases of both facial images and fingerprints. The inclusion of a document scanner, however, provides a totally different added level of security. Specifically, the combination of a camera and document scanner permits comparison of the image taken by the camera to databases of facial images as in prior systems, but the document scanner also permits comparison of the new facial image taken by the camera to a facial image on an ID such as a passport or driver's license. The functionality that was not present in prior systems is described in the specification of the present application at, for example, paragraphs [0034] and [0041]. Simply put, the device of the present invention provides vastly better security than prior systems because it is not entirely

reliant upon databases of facial images or fingerprints, but rather, it may use those databases and information on ID's currently presented by an individual.

Applicant does not believe any fees are due in connection with the Application, but if any such fees are due, including any necessary extension of time, such fees may be charged to Deposit Account 50-2837.

Respectfully submitted,

24IP Law Group USA, PLLC



Date: February 26, 2007

By: _____

Timothy R. DeWitt
Registration No. 35,857
24IP Law Group USA, PLLC
600 Cameron Street, Ste. 408
Alexandria, VA 22314
Tel: 703-340-1686
Fax: 703-340-1687